1 2 3 4 5 6	Robert Beatty-Walters, WSB #27767 rbw@beattywalterslaw.com Mary L. Pool, WSB #29020 mlp@beattywalterslaw.com Law Office of Robert Beatty-Walters 3838 SE Franklin Street Portland, OR 97202-1737 P: (503) 473-8088 F: (503) 473-8089	
7	IN THE UNITED STAT	E DISTRICT COURT
8	EASTERN DISTRICT	OF WASHINGTON
9	SPOKA	ANE
10 11 12	TODD BATTEN, an individual; ROBERT DYER, an individual; REGGIE MORRIS, an individual; and ANNA TESTER, an individual,	Case No. COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGE
13	Plaintiffs,) v.	(MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE AND CORPORATE NEGLIGENCE)
14	PROVIDENCE ST. JOSEPH HEALTH;	
15	PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES; PROVIDENCE HEALTH	
16	AND SERVICES –WASHINGTON d/b/a PROVIDENCE; PROVIDENCE	
17	ST. MARY MEDICAL CENTER; and PROVIDENCE MEDICAL GROUP	
18	d/b/a PROVIDENCE MEDICAL	
19	GROUP SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON) NEUROSURGERY, a/k/a PMG	
20	NEUROSCIENCE INSTITUTE, WALLA WALLA a/k/a	
21	NEUROSCIENCE INSTITUTE d/b/a	
22	PROVIDENCE, Defendants.	
23)	
24	COMES NOW Plaintiffs, by and thro	ough their attorneys of record,
25	ROBERT BEATTY-WALTERS and MAR	Y L. POOL, and for their Complaint
26	hereby allege as follows:	

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGE (MEDICAL NEGLIGENCE AND CORPORATE NEGLIGENCE)
Page 1 of 24

1 I. INTRODUCTION 2 1.1 This is a medical malpractice/corporate negligence action for damages caused by unnecessary and negligent surgeries performed by Defendants' agents 3 and employees, including JASON A. DREYER, D.O., ("Dr. Dreyer") and 4 5 DANIEL P. ELSKENS, M.D., ("Dr. Elskens") for the profit of, and on behalf of 6 Defendants PROVIDENCE ST. JOSEPH HEALTH; PROVIDENCE HEALTH & 7 SERVICES; PROVIDENCE HEALTH AND SERVICES –WASHINGTON d/b/a 8 PROVIDENCE; PROVIDENCE ST. MARY MEDICAL CENTER; and 9 PROVIDENCE MEDICAL GROUP d/b/a PROVIDENCE MEDICAL GROUP 10 SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON NEUROSURGERY, a/k/a PMG 11 NEUROSCIENCE INSTITUTE, WALLA WALLA a/k/a NEUROSCIENCE 12 INSTITUTE d/b/a PROVIDENCE (hereinafter defendant "Providence"). 13 1.2 Defendant Providence owns and operates St. Mary Medical Center 14 (SMMC), a hospital located in Walla Walla, Washington. SMMC has multiple 15 departments, one of which is the neurosurgery department. 16 1.3 Between July 1, 2013 and November 13, 2018 (hereinafter the 17 relevant time period) Dr. Dreyer and Dr. Elskens were neurosurgeons employed 18 by Providence at SMMC. Dr. Dreyer was a neurosurgeon employed by Providence at SMMC during the entire relevant time period, while Dr. Elskens was a 19 20 neurosurgeon employed by Providence at SMMC between November 2015 and 21 May 2017. During the relevant time period, SMMC's neurosurgery department, 22 1.4 23 including Dr. Dreyer and Dr. Elskens, performed a high volume of multi-level 24 spinal surgeries. SMMC staff neurosurgeons, including Dr. Dreyer and 25 Dr. Elskens, were paid compensation based on a personal productivity metric known as Work Relative Value Units (wRVUs), which were calculated based on a 26

- 1 value assigned under the Medicare Physician Fee Schedule to the services
- 2 personally furnished by the individual neurosurgeon. SMMC neurosurgeons,
- 3 including Dr. Dreyer and Dr. Elskens, were paid compensation for each wRVU
- 4 that they generated, with no cap on the wRVU-based compensation that could be
- 5 earned. In this manner, the greater the number of procedures of higher complexity
- 6 that the neurosurgeon performed, the greater the compensation the neurosurgeon
- 7 received.
- 8 1.5 Between 2014 and 2018, Dr. Dreyer's personal productivity, as
- 9 measured by wRVUs, exceeded the 90th percentile of physician market survey data,
- and he was among the top producing neurosurgeons in the Providence system.
- 11 Based on this productivity, between 2014 and 2017, Dr. Dreyer earned between
- 12 \$2.5 million and \$2.9 million annually. On information and belief, during the
- 13 relevant time period, Dr. Elskens' personal productivity, as measured by wRVUs,
- 14 exceeded the 90th percentile of physician market survey data.
- 1.6 At various times during the relevant time period, Providence received
- both positive and negative information about Dr. Dreyer and Dr. Elskens.
- 17 However, Providence personnel also had and articulated concerns regarding the
- 18 quality of care provided by Dr. Dreyer and Dr. Elskens, as well as the medical
- 19 necessity of surgical procedures performed by Dr. Dreyer. These included
- 20 concerns that Dr. Dreyer: (1) completed medical documentation with falsified,
- 21 exaggerated, and/or inaccurate diagnoses that did not accurately reflect the
- 22 patient's true medical condition in order to obtain reimbursement for surgical
- 23 procedures performed by Dr. Dreyer; (2) performed certain surgical procedures
- 24 that did not meet the medical necessity guidelines and requirements for
- 25 reimbursement set forth by Medicare and other government and private health
- 26 insurance programs; (3) "over-operated", i.e., performed a surgery of greater

- 1 complexity and scope than was indicated and medically appropriate; and (4)
- 2 jeopardized patient safety by attempting to perform an excessive number of overly
- 3 complex surgeries.
- 4 1.7 These concerns also included concerns that Dr. Dreyer and
- 5 Dr. Elskens: (1) endangered the safety of SMMC patients; (2) created an excessive
- 6 level of complications, negative outcomes, and necessary additional operations as a
- 7 result of their surgeries; (3) performed surgical procedures on certain candidates
- 8 who were not appropriate candidates for surgery given their medical histories,
- 9 conditions, and contraindications; and (4) failed to adequately and accurately
- 10 document certain procedures, diagnoses, and complications.
- 1.8 On February 23, 2017, as a result of concerns articulated by SMMC
- 12 medical staff, Providence placed Dr. Elskens on administrative leave and, shortly
- 13 thereafter, initiated an independent analysis of certain concerns articulated as to Dr.
- 14 Elskens with regard to certain specific patients.
- 15 1.9 On May 8, 2017, at a time in which Dr. Elskens was still under
- 16 investigation by professional review bodies under the control of Providence
- 17 relating to possible incompetence or improper professional conduct, and which
- 18 adversely affected Dr. Elskens' clinical privileges to perform surgery, Providence
- 19 accepted Dr. Elskens' resignation. Providence did not report Dr. Elskens to the
- 20 National Practitioner Data Bank, which is a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(1),
- 21 or report Dr. Elskens to the Washington State Department of Health.
- 22 1.10 On May 22, 2018, as a result of concerns articulated by SMMC
- 23 medical staff, Providence placed Dr. Dreyer on administrative leave and initiated
- 24 an independent analysis of certain concerns articulated as to Dr. Dreyer with regard
- 25 to certain specific patients.
- 26 1.11 On November 13, 2018, at a time in which Dr. Dreyer was still under

- 1 investigation by Providence relating to possible incompetence or improper
- 2 professional conduct, Dr. Dreyer submitted his letter of resignation to Providence,
- 3 which Providence accepted. Providence did not report Dr. Dreyer to the National
- 4 Practitioner Data Bank, which is a violation of 42 U.S.C. § 11133(a)(1), or report
- 5 Dr. Dreyer to the Washington State Department of Health.

6 II. PARTIES

- 7 2.1. Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, REGGIE MORRIS,
- 8 and ANNA TESTER, re-allege paragraphs 1.1 to 1.11 as though fully set forth
- 9 herein.
- 10 2.2 Plaintiff, TODD BATTEN, was at all times relevant to this cause of
- action over the age of majority and residing in Elgin, Oregon.
- 12 2.3 Plaintiff, ROBERT DYER, was at all times relevant to this cause of
- 13 action over the age of majority and residing in Elgin, Oregon.
- 14 2.4 Plaintiff, REGGIE MORRIS, was at all times relevant to this cause of
- 15 action over the age of majority and residing in Pendleton, Oregon.
- 16 2.5 Plaintiff, ANNA TESTER, was at all times relevant to this cause of
- 17 action over the age of majority and residing in Pilot Rock, Oregon.
- 18 2.6 Defendants PROVIDENCE ST. JOSEPH HEALTH; PROVIDENCE
- 19 HEALTH & SERVICES; PROVIDENCE HEALTH AND SERVICES
- 20 –WASHINGTON d/b/a PROVIDENCE; PROVIDENCE ST. MARY MEDICAL
- 21 CENTER; and PROVIDENCE MEDICAL GROUP d/b/a PROVIDENCE
- 22 MEDICAL GROUP SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON NEUROSURGERY, a/k/a
- 23 PMG NEUROSCIENCE INSTITUTE, WALLA WALLA a/k/a NEUROSCIENCE
- 24 INSTITUTE d/b/a PROVIDENCE, (hereinafter "PROVIDENCE") are
- 25 Washington State corporations located in Renton, Washington, and Walla Walla,
- 26 Washington, and regularly conducting business in Walla Walla County,

- 1 Washington.
- 2 2.7 PROVIDENCE ST. JOSEPH HEALTH and PROVIDENCE
- 3 HEALTH & SERVICES WASHINGTON did business as PROVIDENCE ST.
- 4 MARY MEDICAL CENTER and PROVIDENCE MEDICAL GROUP
- 5 SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON NEUROSURGERY. Defendant PROVIDENCE
- 6 HEALTH & SERVICES WASHINGTON, d/b/a PROVIDENCE ST. MARY
- 7 MEDICAL CENTER, and d/b/a PROVIDENCE MEDICAL GROUP
- 8 SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON NEUROSURGERY are referred to hereinafter
- 9 collectively and individually as "Defendant PROVIDENCE."
- 10 2.8 JASON A. DREYER, D.O. (hereinafter "Dr. DREYER"), was at all
- 11 times material, an osteopathic physician and surgeon licensed to practice in the
- state of Washington, specializing in neurosurgery and engaged in the provision of
- 13 medical and surgical care to Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, and
- 14 REGGIE MORRIS, as an agent and/or employee of Defendant PROVIDENCE. At
- all times relevant hereto, Dr, DREYER held himself out to be a medical and
- surgical care provider whose services were offered to the public for compensation.
- 17 All acts or omissions committed by Dr. DREYER were done in the course and
- 18 scope of his employment with, on behalf of, and for the benefit of, his employer,
- 19 defendant Providence.
- 20 2.9 DANIEL P. ELSKENS, M.D. (hereinafter "Dr. ELSKENS"), was
- 21 during the relevant time period, a physician and surgeon licensed to practice in the
- 22 state of Washington, specializing in neurosurgery and engaged in the provision of
- 23 medical and surgical care to Plaintiff ANNA TESTER, as an agent and/or
- 24 employee of Defendant PROVIDENCE. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant
- 25 Providence held Dr. ELSKENS out to be a medical and surgical care provider
- 26 whose services were offered to the public for compensation. All acts or omissions

1	committed by Dr. ELSKENS were done in the course and scope of his employs	nent
2	with, on behalf of, and for the benefit of, his employer, defendant Providence.	
3	III. JURISDICTION/VENUE	
4	3.1. Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, REGGIE MORRIS	,
5	and ANNA TESTER re-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 2.9 as though fully set for	orth
6	herein.	
7	3.2 This court has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims pursuant to 28	
8	U.S.C. § 1332, because there is complete diversity of citizenship between the	
9	parties, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00, exclusive of interes	t
10	and costs.	
11	3.3. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because	e a
12	substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the claims alleged in	the
13	Complaint occurred in the Eastern District of Washington, specifically the Spot	kane
14	Division; and, one or more of the Defendants resides in the Eastern District of	
15	Washington Court.	
16	IV. FACTS	
17	4.1 Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, REGGIE MORRIS	,
18	and ANNA TESTER re-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 3.3 as though fully set for	orth
19	herein.	
20	4.2 Plaintiff TODD BATTEN	
21	4.2.1 On or about June 15, 2015, plaintiff TODD BATTEN sough	nt
22	consultation with Dr. Dreyer. Dr. Dreyer falsely interpreted a December 4, 201	4,
23	MRI of Plaintiff TODD BATTEN'S cervical spine to include a "dynamic	
24	instability with spondylolisthesis C5-6," and "spondylosis C4-5, C6-7" with	
25	"resulting foraminal stenosis at those levels." In addition, Dr. Dreyer falsely	
26	asserted Plaintiff TODD BATTEN suffered from "arm symptoms down the lef	ţ

l	side." Dr. Dreyer	recom	mended a multi-level anterior cervical disc fusion (ACDF)
2	from C4-7. On Ju	ly 15,	2015, Plaintiff TODD BATTEN underwent an anterior
3	cervical disk fusio	n (AC	DF) surgery at the C4-7 levels, with plating, which was
4	not medically indi	cated,	and subjected Plaintiff TODD BATTEN to unnecessary
5	risk from surgery,	at PRO	OVIDENCE ST. MARY MEDICAL CENTER in Walla
6	Walla, Washington	n, whic	ch was reported and billed to Plaintiff and his health
7	insurance compani	ies to i	nclude the following:
8		1.	C4-5, C5-6, C6-7 anterior interbody diskectomy with
9			decompression of the spinal court and osteophytectomy;
0		2.	C4-5, C5-6, C6-7 anterior interbody arthrodesis;
1		3.	C4-5, C5-6, C6-7 insertion of interbody allograft;
12		4.	C4-C7 anterior instrumentation;
13		5.	Microsurgical techniques;
4		6.	Fluroscopic guidance for localization and
15			instrumentation.
16	4.2.2	As a 1	result of this unnecessary surgery performed by Dr.
17	Dreyer, plaintiff T	ODD 1	BATTEN suffered from adjacent segment disease in his
8	cervical spine at C	3, in a	ddition to other symptoms, including increasing pain, and
9	loss of range of mo	otion.	Dr. Dreyer then recommended additional unnecessary
20	surgery at C3, in a	dditio	n to a revision of the prior unnecessary surgery.
21	4.2.3	On or	about April 18, 2018, Dr. Dreyer performed a second
22	unnecessary and ne	ot med	lically indicated procedure on Plaintiff TODD BATTEN,
23	including the follo	wing:	
24		1.	C3-4 anterior interbody diskectomy with decompression
25			of the spinal cord and osteophytectomy;
26		2.	C6-7 revision anterior interbody diskectomy with

1		decompression of the spinal cord and osteophytectomy;
2	3.	C3-4, C6-7 anterior interbody arthrodesis;
3	4.	C3-4, C6-7 insertion of interbody PEEK cage;
4	5.	C3-C4 anterior instrumentation;
5	6.	C6-C7 separate anterior instrumentation;
6	7.	Microsurgical techniques;
7	8.	Fluoroscopic guidance for localization and
8		instrumentation;
9	9.	Hardware removal at C5 without reinsertion.
10	4.2.4 Each	of these procedures were unnecessary and not medically
11	indicated, and undertake	en to maximize reimbursement and profit to both
12	Providence and Dr. Drey	yer personally.
13	4.2.5 As a	result of these unnecessary and not medically indicated
14	surgeries, Plaintiff TOD	D BATTEN now suffers from permanent injury in his
15	cervical spine, causing p	pain, loss of mobility, and other harms that he would not
16	have suffered but for Pro	ovidence and Dr. Dreyer's negligence in performing these
17	unnecessary surgical pro	ocedures.
18	4.2.6 Plain	tiff TODD BATTEN learned of the fact that Providence
19	had allowed Dr. Dreyer	to perform unnecessary surgeries on or about April 12,
20	2022, and could not reas	onably have discovered Providence and Dr. Dreyer's
21	negligence in performin	g unnecessary surgeries upon his cervical spine before
22	April 12, 2022, when he	learned of defendant Providence's settlement with the US
23	Attorney for the Eastern	District of Washington on Federal False Claims Act
24	violations.	
25	4.3 Plaintiff RO	OBERT DYER
26	4.3.1 On o	r about August 22, 2017, Plaintiff ROBERT DYER sought

- 1 consultation with Providence providers, including Physician Assistant Derek 2 Sucharda. At that time Mr. Sucarda interpreted a June, 2017, MRI as showing mild to moderate foraminal stenosis at L3-L4, right mild to moderate foraminal 3 stenosis at L4-L5 and L5-S1. Subsequent to this visit, on November 8, 2017, 4 5 February 28, 2018, and March 13, 2018, Dr. Dreyer falsely described the same 6 MRI of the lumbar spine from June of 2017 to demonstrate spondylosis L3-4 and L5-S1, spondylolisthesis L4-5, significant facet hypertrophy L3-4, L4-5, and 7 8 L5-S1, moderate lateral recess stenosis at L3-4, moderate central and severe 9 lateral recess stenosis at L4-5, and severe right foraminal stenosis at L5-S1. Dr. Dreyer recommended a three level fusion of Plaintiff DYER's lumbar spine from 10 L3-S1, using a lateral and posterior approaches. This recommendation was made 11 12 even though the pathology present on Plaintiff ROBERT DYER'S MRI studies, 13 nor his clinical signs and symptoms, showed the surgery to be medically indicated. 14 4.3.2 On or about March 13, 2018, Plaintiff ROBERT DYER 15 underwent an unnecessary and not medically indicated three-level fusion on his 16 lumbar spine, and subjected Plaintiff ROBERT DYER to unnecessary risk from surgery, at PROVIDENCE ST. MARY MEDICAL CENTER in Walla, 17 18 Washington, which was reported and billed to Plaintiff and his health insurance
- 20 1. Anterior lumbar interbody arthrodesis, L3-4, L4-5 lateral approach;
- 22 2. Postereolateral arthrodesis, L3-4, L4-5;

companies to include the following:

19

- 23
 24
 Combined posterior interbody and posterolateral arthrodesis, L5-S1;
- 25 4. PEEK interbody L3-4, L4-5, L5-S1;
- 26 5. Posterior spinal instrumentation L3-S1;

6. Laminectomies L4, L5, S1 for the purpose of
decompression;
7. Use of allograft;
8. Use of microscope for microsurgical techniques;
9. Co-registration with navigation system for spinal
navigation;
4.3.3 Each of these procedures were unnecessary and not medically
indicated, and were undertaken to maximize reimbursement and profit to both
Providence and Dr. Dreyer personally.
4.3.4 As a result of these unnecessary and not medically indicated
surgeries, Plaintiff ROBERT DYER now suffers from permanent injury in his
lumbar spine, causing pain, loss of mobility, and other harms, including an
abdominal hernia, that he would not have suffered but for Providence and Dr.
Dreyer's negligence in performing these unnecessary surgical procedures.
4.3.5 Plaintiff ROBERT DYER learned of the fact that Providence
had allowed Dr. Dreyer to perform unnecessary surgeries on or about May 21,
2022, and could not reasonably have discovered Providence and Dr. Dreyer's
negligence in performing unnecessary surgeries upon his lumbar spine before May
21, 2022, when he learned of defendant Providence's settlement with the US
Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington on Federal False Claims Act
violations.
4.4 Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS
4.4.1 Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS was referred to Dr. Dreyer on or
about June 23, 2016, for pain in his mid-back. MRI studies done September 12,
2016, showed a previously demonstrated mild disc bulge at T6-7 had "nearly
disappeared." A CT scan done November 8, 2016, showed no disc bulge or

1	protrusion seen through	out the thoracic spine and no central canal stenosis.
2	Nevertheless, Dr. Dreye	er falsely asserted these films showed thoracic spondylosis
3	and stenosis at T6-7, an	d a disc bulge and deformation of the spinal cord on the
4	right at T6-7 and recom	mended fusion of the thoracic spine at T6-7.
5	4.4.2 On o	or about January 17, 2017, Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS
6	underwent unnecessary	and extensive surgery performed by Dr. Dreyer on his
7	thoracic spine, and subj	ected Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS to unnecessary risk from
8	surgery, at PROVIDEN	CE ST. MARY MEDICAL CENTER in Walla Walla,
9	Washington, which was	reported and billed to Plaintiff and his health insurance
10	companies to include th	e following:
11	1.	Combined posterior interbody and posterolateral
12		arthrodesis T6-7;
13	2.	Posterior spinal instrumentation T6-7;
14	3.	PEEK Interbody at T6-7;
15	4.	Laminectomy at T6 and T7 for purposes of
16		decompression;
17	5.	Use of intraoperative microscope for microdissection;
18	6.	Co-registration for the purposes of spinal navigation.
19	4.4.3 Follo	owing this surgery, Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS began to
20	experience stabbing and	I shooting pain, thoracic pain, radiculopathy, cramps, and
21	spasms. The area becar	ne infected and, in 2018, another surgery was required to
22	remove the spinal pedic	le screw instrumentation and other hardware. The surgeon
23	performing the removal	determined that it was not safe or feasible to remove the
24	interbody cage and it re	mains in Mr. Morris's thoracic spine.
25	4.4.4 In 20	022, a spinal cord stimulator was implanted, but only
26	provided minimal relief	from the pain. Mr. Morris continues to need opiate pain

1	medication to get through each day. His life has become focused on seeking relief
2	from the pain. The pain makes most activities difficult, and some impossible. As
3	time has passed it is worsening, and almost constant. As a result, he will require
4	pain medications and management for the rest of his life.
5	4.4.5 In April 2021, a family member gave Plaintiff REGGIE
6	MORRIS a news article about the fraud by Dr. Dreyer and Providence, and Reggie
7	Morris first began to suspect that his thoracic spine surgery that has caused so
8	much harm, was unnecessary. He later learned about Providence's role in
9	incentivizing Dr. Dreyer to perform extensive and unnecessary spine surgeries for
10	financial gain that benefitted Providence and Dr. Dreyer, while causing him and
11	others in the community significant harm.
12	4.4.6 Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS learned in or about April of 2021
13	of the fact that Providence had allowed Dr. Dreyer to perform an unnecessary
14	surgery, and could not reasonably have discovered Providence and Dr. Dreyer's
15	negligence in performing unnecessary surgeries upon his thoracic spine before
16	April of 2021, when he learned though news reports of defendant Providence's and
17	Dr. Dreyer's alleged fraud in another case.
18	4.4.7 On or about February 22, 2022, pursuant to RCW 7.70.110,
19	Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS, served a Good Faith Request for Mediation on
20	defendant Providence and Dr. Dreyer. On November 10, 2022, Plaintiff REGGIE
21	MORRIS, defendant Providence, and Dr. Dreyer, entered into a tolling agreement
22	extending the statute of limitations tolled by the Good Faith Request for Mediation
23	until May 22, 2023, to allow time for mediation. A good faith mediation was held
24	on March 28, 2023, which was unsuccessful.
25	4.5 Plaintiff ANNA TESTER

4.5.1 On or about November 29, 2016, Plaintiff Anna Tester sought

26

I	consultation with Dr. Daniel Elskens at defendant Providence clinic for pain in her
2	lumbar spine. Dr. Elskens recommended a four level fusion including a lateral
3	anterior interbody fusion with PEEK cages at L2-3, and L3-4; and transforamenal
4	interbody fusion with PEEK cages at L2-3, L3-4, L4-5, and L5-S1. The
5	procedures at L2-3, and L3-4 were not medically indicated or necessary.
6	4.5.2 On or about December 30, 2016, Plaintiff ANNA TESTER
7	underwent a L2-3, L3-4, L4-5, lateral anterior interbody fusion with posterior
8	instrumentation, L5-S1 transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion on her lumbar
9	spine, and subjected Plaintiff ANNA TESTER to unnecessary risk from surgery, at
10	PROVIDENCE ST. MARY MEDICAL CENTER in Walla Walla, Washington,
11	performed by Dr. Elskens, which was reported and billed to Plaintiff and her health
12	insurance companies to include the following:
13	1. L2-3, L3-4 lateral anterior interbody fusion with PEEK
14	cages;
15	2. Posterior on lay facet fusions L2-3, 3-4, 4-5, and L5-S1;
16	3. L4-5 and L5-S1 transforamenal interbody fusion with
17	PEEK cages;
18	4. posterior instrumentation L2-S1 with Stealth guidance
19	4.5.3 The procedures performed at L2-3 and L3-4, were unnecessary
20	and not medically indicated, and undertaken to maximize reimbursement and profit
21	to both Providence and Dr. Elskens personally.
22	4.5.4 As a result of these unnecessary and not medically indicated
23	surgeries, Plaintiff ANNA TESTER now suffers from permanent injury in her
24	lumbar spine, causing pain, loss of mobility, and other harms that he would not
25	have suffered but for Providence and Dr. Elskens' negligence in performing these
26	unnecessary surgical procedures.

1	4.5.5 Plaintiff ANNA TESTER learned of the fact that Providence
2	had allowed Dr. Elskens to perform unnecessary surgeries on or about April 12,
3	2022, and could not reasonably have discovered Providence and Dr. Elskens'
4	negligence in performing unnecessary surgeries upon her lumbar spine before
5	April 12, 2022, when she learned of defendant Providence's settlement with the US
6	Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington on Federal False Claims Act
7	violations.
8	$\mathbf{V}_{f \cdot}$
9	CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENCE VS DEFENDANT PROVIDENCE
10	DEFENDANT PROVIDENCE
11	5.1 Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, REGGIE MORRIS,
12	and ANNA TESTER re-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 4.5.5 as though fully set
13	forth herein.
14	5.2 Defendant PROVIDENCE owed Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN,
15	ROBERT DYER, REGGIE MORRIS, and ANNA TESTER a non-delegable duty
16	of care to assure that they received safe and appropriate surgical care, performed in
17	a safe and reasonable manner, and to adopt written policies and procedures specific
18	to surgical services, and to provide for medical staff who were qualified, trained,
19	and supervised subject to the medical direction of Defendant PROVIDENCE.
20	5.3 Defendant PROVIDENCE had a duty to select and retain only
21	competent physicians and surgeons; a duty to formulate, adopt and enforce
22	adequate rules and policies to ensure quality care for their patients, including a
23	duty to maintain a coordinated quality improvement program for the improvement
24	of the quality of health care services rendered to patients and the identification and
25	prevention of medical malpractice; a duty to supervise its members and employees
26	to assure that they adhere to the relevant standard of patient care, including a duty

1	to create qualit	ty im	approvement committees to monitor and review the performance
2	of their medica	al sta	aff; and, a duty to maintain and continuously collect information
3	concerning the	hos	pital's experience with negative health care outcomes and
4	incidents injuri	ious	to patients as they relate to specific physicians and surgeons.
5	5.4 D	efen	dant PROVIDENCE breached the afore listed duties by, without
6	liı	mita	tion:
7	5.	.4.1	Failing to formulate, adopt and enforce adequate rules, policies;
8			and/or adopting policing or practices which in themselves
9			created an unnecessary and unreasonable risk of harm to
10			Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, REGGIE
11			MORRIS, and ANNA TESTER;
12	5.	.4.2	Failing to ensure proper oversight of its employees or agents to
13			assure that Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER,
14			REGGIE MORRIS, and ANNA TESTER'S care was
15			appropriate and within the relevant standard of care;
16	5.	.4.3	Defendant PROVIDENCE, negligently failed to monitor,
17			proctor, or control, the surgical practice of Dr. DREYER and
18			Dr. ELSKENS when Defendant PROVIDENCE knew or
19			should have known that such monitoring, proctoring, or control
20			was necessary because of results of prior surgical cases of Dr.
21			DREYER and Dr. ELSKENS;
22	5.	4.4	Defendant PROVIDENCE, negligently failed to restrict or
23			terminate Dr. DREYER'S surgical privileges and/or his
24			employment prior to January 19, 2017, and negligently failed to
25			restrict or terminate Dr. ELSKENS' surgical privileges and/or
26			his employment prior to December 30, 2016, when Defendant

1		PROVIDENCE knew or should have known that Dr. DREYER
2		and Dr. ELSKENS had performed other medically unnecessary
3		and excessive neurosurgical procedures including unnecessary
4		spinal fusions, and used unnecessary instrumentation and
5		medical hardware for the purpose earning excessive profits;
6	5.4.5	In failing to restrict or terminate Dr. DREYER'S surgical
7		privileges and/or his employment prior to January 19, 2017, and
8		negligently failed to restrict or terminate Dr. ELSKENS'
9		surgical privileges and/or his employment prior to December
10		30, 2016, when Defendant PROVIDENCE knew or should have
11		known that Dr. DREYER and Dr. ELSKENS had caused other
12		patient injuries in connection with neurosurgical procedures,
13		including unnecessary spinal fusions, and the use of
14		unnecessary instrumentation and medical hardware;
15	5.4.6	In failing to have properly-trained and objective surgeons
16		systematically reviewing and scrutinizing Dr. DREYER'S and
17		Dr. ELSKENS' surgeries performed at Defendant
18		PROVIDENCE prior January 19, 2017, and December 30,
19		2016, respectively, for medical necessity and standard of care
20		or other harm;
21	5.4.7	In failing to have in place proper, effective and consistent
22		quality assurance review processes and procedures that were
23		unbiased and based upon reviews by objective physicians and
24		surgeons trained in peer review, as required by law, and the
25		standard of care for hospitals; and,
26	5.4.8	In deviating below the standard of care for a Hospital by failing

1	to adequately monitor, proctor or control, neurosurgical cases
2	performed by Dr. DREYER and Dr. ELSKENS to assure their
3	surgical care was medically necessary and not done for the
4	purposes of earning excessive profit.
5	5.5 In respect to the above, PROVIDENCE, individually, and by and
6	through the acts and omissions of its agents, representatives, employees and/or
7	ostensible agents, failed to exercise the degree of skill and learning of a reasonably
8	prudent hospital providing medical and neurosurgical care, including through
9	employee or agent neurosurgeons performing in the same or similar circumstances;
10	and, the failure to exercise such skill, care and learning was a proximate cause of
11	the injuries and damages sustained by Plaintiffs, as set forth herein above.
12	PROVIDENCE is directly liable to the named Plaintiffs under the corporate
13	negligence doctrine.
14	VI. CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENCE
15	(Respondent Superior) for JASON A. DREYER, D.O.
16	
	5.6 Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 5.5 as though fully set forth
17	5.6 Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 5.5 as though fully set forth herein.
17 18	
	herein.
18	herein. 5.7 In performing his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. DREYER had a duty
18 19	herein. 5.7 In performing his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. DREYER had a duty of care to act with the degree of skill, care, and learning of a reasonably prudent
18 19 20	herein. 5.7 In performing his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. DREYER had a duty of care to act with the degree of skill, care, and learning of a reasonably prudent neurosurgeon in the State of Washington performing neurosurgery in the same or
18 19 20 21	herein. 5.7 In performing his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. DREYER had a duty of care to act with the degree of skill, care, and learning of a reasonably prudent neurosurgeon in the State of Washington performing neurosurgery in the same or similar circumstances at the time of the care or treatment in question.
18 19 20 21 22	herein. 5.7 In performing his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. DREYER had a duty of care to act with the degree of skill, care, and learning of a reasonably prudent neurosurgeon in the State of Washington performing neurosurgery in the same or similar circumstances at the time of the care or treatment in question. 5.8 Dr. DREYER breached his duty of care and was negligent by, without
18 19 20 21 22 23	herein. 5.7 In performing his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. DREYER had a duty of care to act with the degree of skill, care, and learning of a reasonably prudent neurosurgeon in the State of Washington performing neurosurgery in the same or similar circumstances at the time of the care or treatment in question. 5.8 Dr. DREYER breached his duty of care and was negligent by, without limitation: failing to follow the standard of care for reasonably prudent
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	herein. 5.7 In performing his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. DREYER had a duty of care to act with the degree of skill, care, and learning of a reasonably prudent neurosurgeon in the State of Washington performing neurosurgery in the same or similar circumstances at the time of the care or treatment in question. 5.8 Dr. DREYER breached his duty of care and was negligent by, without limitation: failing to follow the standard of care for reasonably prudent neurosurgeons performing in the same or similar circumstances during the course

l	5.9 A	dditi	onally, PROVIDENCE is vicariously liable for the negligence	
2	of its employee	es an	d agents, including Dr. DREYER, and subject to the doctrine of	
3	respondeat superior. In this regard, PROVIDENCE is liable to Plaintiff TODD			
4	BATTEN for the following breaches of the standard of care for cervical spine			
5	surgery by its employees or agents (without limitation):			
6	5.	9.1	In falsely documenting Mr. Batten's symptoms to include arm	
7			pain, when he had none, in order to falsely justify doing	
8			surgery;	
9	5.	9.2	In falsely documenting the findings on Mr. Batten's imaging	
10			studies to include a "dynamic instability with spondylolisthesis	
11			C5-6," and "spondylosis C4-5, C6-7" with "resulting foraminal	
12			stenosis at those levels" in order to fraudulently support the	
13			unnecessary surgery on his cervical spine;	
14	5.	9.3	In performing an unnecessary and not medically indicated	
15			surgery on Mr. Batten's cervical spine on July 15, 2015;	
16	5.	9.4	In negligently recommending and using excessive medical	
17			device hardware instrumentation on Mr. Batten's spine when	
18			such instrumentation was not medically necessary;	
19	5.	9.5	In performing an unnecessary and not medically indicated	
20			surgery on Mr. Batten's cervical spine on April 18, 2018; and	
21	5.	9.6	In negligently performing these surgeries in order to maximize	
22			reimbursement and profit to both Providence and Dr. Dreyer	
23			personally.	
24	5.10 T	he bi	reaches in the standard of care by PROVIDENCE employees	
25	and/or agents were a proximate cause of the injuries and damages sustained by			
26	Plaintiff TODD BATTEN, as set forth herein above.			

1	5.11 Additio	nally, PROVIDENCE is vicariously liable for the negligence	
2	of its employees and	agents, including Dr. DREYER, and subject to the doctrine of	
3	respondeat superior.	In this regard, PROVIDENCE is liable to Plaintiff ROBERT	
4	DYER for the follow	ving breaches of the standard of care for lumbar spine surgery	
5	by its employees or	agents (without limitation):	
6	5.11.1	In falsely interpreting Mr. Dyer's imaging studies to	
7		justify doing an unnecessary and not medically indicated	
8		surgery on Mr. Dyer's lumbar spine;	
9	5.11.2	In negligently recommending and using excessive	
10		medical device hardware instrumentation on Mr. Dyer's	
11		spine when such instrumentation was not medically	
12		necessary;	
13	5.11.3	In performing an unnecessary and not medically	
14		indicated surgery on Mr. Dyer's lumbar spine on March	
15		14, 2018; and,	
16	5.11.4	In negligently performing these surgeries in order to	
17		maximize reimbursement and profit to both Providence	
18		and Dr. Dreyer personally.	
19	5.12 The bre	aches in the standard of care by PROVIDENCE employees	
20	and/or agents were a	proximate cause of the injuries and damages sustained by	
21	Plaintiff ROBERT D	OYER, as set forth herein above.	
22	5.13 Additio	nally, PROVIDENCE is vicariously liable for the negligence	
23	of its employees and agents, including Dr. DREYER, and subject to the doctrine of		
24	respondeat superior. In this regard, PROVIDENCE is liable to Plaintiff REGGIE		
25	MORRIS for the following	llowing breaches of the standard of care for thoracic spine	
26	surgery by its emplo	yees or agents (without limitation):	

1		5.13.1	In falsely asserted preoperative imaging studies showed		
2			thoracic spondylosis and stenosis at T6-7, and a disc		
3			bulge and deformation of the spinal cord on the right at		
4			T6-7;		
5		5.13.2	In negligently recommending and using excessive		
6			medical device hardware instrumentation on Mr.		
7			Morris's thoracic spine when such instrumentation was		
8			not medically necessary;		
9		5.13.3	In performing an unnecessary and not medically		
0			indicated surgery on Mr. Morris's thoracic spine on		
1			January 19, 2017; and,		
12		5.13.4	In negligently performing these surgeries in order to		
13			maximize reimbursement and profit to both Providence		
14			and Dr. Dreyer personally.		
15	5.14	The breache	es in the standard of care by PROVIDENCE employees		
16	and/or agen	ts were a pro	ximate cause of the injuries and damages sustained by		
17	7 Plaintiff REGGIE MORRIS, as set forth herein above.				
18		CAU	VII. SE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENCE t Superior) for DANIEL P. ELSKENS, M.D.		
9		(Respondea	t Superior) for DANIEL P. ELSKENS, M.D.		
20	6.1	Plaintiffs re	-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 5.14 as though fully set		
21	forth herein				
22	6.2	In performi	ng his duties as a neurosurgeon, Dr. ELSKENS had a duty		
23	of care to ac	et with the de	gree of skill, care, and learning of a reasonably prudent		
24	neurosurgeo	on in the Stat	e of Washington performing neurosurgery in the same or		
25	similar circu	ımstances at	the time of the care or treatment in question.		
26	6.3	Dr. ELSKE	NS breached his duty of care and was negligent by,		

1	without limitation: failing to follow the standard of care for reasonably prudent		
2	neurosurgeons performing in the same or similar circumstances during the course		
3	and scope of his pre-surgical, surgical, and follow-up care of Plaintiff ANNA		
4	TESTER, as follows:		
5	6.4 Dr. ELSKENS committed these negligent acts during the scope of his		
6	employment with and for Defendant PROVIDENCE and while performing duties		
7	as an actual agent of PROVIDENCE.		
8	6.5 As a direct and proximate result of Dr. ELSKENS' actions or		
9	omissions which constituted negligence, Plaintiff ANNA TESTER suffered		
0	injuries and damages in an amount and to an extent to be set forth fully at trial.		
1	Defendant PROVIDENCE is now liable to Plaintiff ANNA TESTER for Dr.		
12	ELSKENS' breach of the duty of care as set forth herein above.		
13	6.6 Additionally, PROVIDENCE is vicariously liable for the negligence		
4	of its employees and agents, including Dr. ELSKENS, and subject to the doctrine		
15	of respondeat superior. In this regard, PROVIDENCE is liable to Plaintiff ANNE		
16	TESTER for the following breaches of the standard of care for lumbar spine		
17	surgery by its employees or agents (without limitation):		
8	6.6.1 In negligently recommending and using excessive medical		
9	device hardware instrumentation on Ms. Tester's lumbar spine		
20	at L2-3, and L3-4 when such instrumentation was not medically		
21	necessary;		
22	6.6.2 In falsely asserted preoperative imaging studies showed		
23	instability and severe stenosis at L2-3, and L3-4, when no such		
24	findings existed;		
25	6.6.3 In negligently recommending and using excessive medical		
26	device hardware instrumentation on Ms. Tester's lumbar spine		

1	when such instrumentation was not medically necessary;		
2	6.6.4 In performing an unnecessary and not medically indicated		
3	surgery on Ms. Tester's lumbar spine on December 30, 2016;		
4	and,		
5	6.6.5 In negligently performing these surgeries in order to maximize		
6	reimbursement and profit to both Providence and Dr. Elskens		
7	personally.		
8	6.7 The breaches in the standard of care by PROVIDENCE employees		
9	and/or agents were a proximate cause of the injuries and damages sustained by		
10	Plaintiff ANNE TESTER, as set forth herein above.		
11	VIII. ACTING IN CONCERT		
12	7.1 Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 6.7 as though fully set forth		
13	herein.		
14	7.2 At all times relevant hereto, the named Defendants, as well as their		
15	involved employees or agents, were acting in concert. As set forth herein above,		
16	all acts or omissions of the Defendants, their employees or agents in respect to the		
17	negligent care of Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, REGGIE		
18	MORRIS, and ANNA TESTER and related injuries and damages are indivisible.		
19	The Defendants are jointly and severally liable for the damages caused by the		
20	negligent care of Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT DYER, REGGIE		
21	MORRIS, and ANNA TESTER.		
22	IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF		
23	8.1 Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1.1 through 7.2 as though fully set forth		
24	herein.		
25	8.2 NOW WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against the		
26	above-named Defendants and in favor of Plaintiffs TODD BATTEN, ROBERT		

1	DYER, REGGIE	MORRIS, and ANNA TESTER as follows:
2	8.2.1	For an award of special damages in an amount to be proven at
3		trial;
4	8.2.2	For an award of general damages in an amount to be proven at
5		trial;
6	8.2.3	For an award of attorney's fees and costs if available;
7	8.2.4	For an award of statutory, exemplary, or punitive damages if
8		available;
9	8.2.5	For an award of prejudgment interest;
0	8.2.6	For such other and further relief, as the court deems just and
1		equitable.
12	8.3 Plair	ntiffs reserve the right to amend the Complaint pursuant to the
13	Court rules.	
4	Demand for	or trial by Jury: Plaintiffs hereby demand that this case be tried
15	to a jury panel of	12 jurors with a number of alternates as agreed by the parties and
16	ordered by the Co	ourt.
17	DATED th	is 10 th day of April, 2023.
18		LAW OFFICE OF ROBERT BEATTY-WALTERS
19		Rober Butto Wish
20		
21		ROBERT BEATTY-WALTERS, OSB # 954497 3838 SE Franklin St.
22		Portland, OR 97202-1737
		ΓΠ. (303) 4/3-0000, ΓΛ. (303) 4/3-0009
23		PH: (503) 473-8088; FX: (503) 473-8089 rbw@beattywalterslaw.com Attorney for Plaintiff
23 24		rbw@beattywalterslaw.com Attorney for Plaintiff
		rbw@beattywalterslaw.com Attorney for Plaintiff